

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/188,492 | 11/09/1998 | SEONGHO BAE | 33012-250-10 | 4421 |
| 75 | 7590 04/15/2004 EXAMINER | | INER | |
| CHARLES A JOHNSON | | | WASSUM, LUKE S | |
| UNISYS CORPORATION P O BOX 64942 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| MS 4772 | | | 2177 | 2 |
| ST PAUL, MN 55164 | | | DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004 | 1 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

| e. | | • | / [/ |
|---|---|--|-------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 09/188,492 | BAE, SEONGHO | |
| · | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Luke S. Wassum | 2177 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the o | orrespondence address | |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av- inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic | ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin | g date of the final rejection. | ln |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a). | of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | on |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR) | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | · | |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | * | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | rially reducing or simplifying the | l <u>.</u> |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ing a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | • | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | • | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se | | idered but does NOT place the | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | ٠ |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | |
| 10. Other: | | | |
| | | Hale S Wassum | |
| • | | Luke S. Wassum Art Unit 2177 | |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)





Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The addition of new limitations, such as limiting the service request to a log-on service request, and limiting the delivery to a particular date, would require additional search and further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The examiner has introduced (in the final rejection of record) evidence that the Classic MAPPER DBMS that was available at the time of the invention did not contain the shortcomings that the Applicant has cited in his arguments regarding the lack of motivation to combine references in the rejections of record of claims 5, 15, 19 and 20. This evidence serves to rebut the Applicant's arguments, and does not change the motivation as set forth in the rejection of record.